Student Growth Workgroup

Educator Effectiveness Project

MINUTES

December 7, 2011: Meeting #5

Utah Law and Justice Center

Present: Lynne Baty, Jay Blain, Aaron Brough, Robert Cox, Jen Lambert, David Smith, Wendy Carver, Lori Gardner, Cathy Jensen, Sara Jones, Kerrie Naylor, Selena Terry, Darryl Thomas, Logan Toone, Paul Wagner, and Travis Rawlings.

Excused: Linda Alder, James Birch, John Jesse, JoEllen Shaeffer, Emily Tew, Laurel Brown, Sydnee Dickson, Brian McGill, Judy Park, Leah Voorhies.

Center for Assessment consultation: Chris Domaleski joined the committee at about 11:00 a.m. Scott Marion arrived at about 1:15 p.m.

1. Welcome Kerrie

- Roll, travel vouchers, etc.
 - Review and approve Minutes Meeting #4 Nov. 15, 2011

Minutes were moved and seconded by Logan Toone and Wendy Carver. One correction was made to the minutes by Dr. Thomas. This correction was made and the minutes were approved.

- Review Agenda
- Goals for today

The goals for today were to have the three groups share their models for NTSG, develop some common elements from the models, and begin to formulate criteria for assessing the quality of NTSG teacher assessments.

2. Group Work from Nov. 15: Review Scenario Models and Report Out

Kerrie and Lynne

- What assessment types might be used for NTSG?
- What methods for determining student growth and status might be used?
- What are the SEA and LEA responsibilities?
- What weights might be used?
- 3. Discussion of potential models and consensus building

Participants moved into working groups (from last meeting) to review the models that were developed. After extensive discussion, each group shared the details of the model that they designed. Discussion followed regarding similarities and differences between the three models, including components we liked and as well as concerns.

- Each group was asked to share:
 - What assessment types or analytical measures are you proposing?
 - What are the SEA and LEA responsibilities

How do you address tested and non-tested subjects

Brief summary of each model:

Group 1:

Three main categories:

- 1. Tested
- 2. Non-Tested (traditional academic)
- 3. Non-tested (performance, aesthetic based)

Non-Tested Academic: Suggested that ideally they would like to see state created tests for non-tested academic subjects.

Non-Tested Performance: Should include "other indicators category" (observation, leadership, professional development, parent surveys, etc).

Everyone has a portion of shared attribution (aggregate of the school).

The group came up with a sliding scale approach. Depending on what a teacher teaches determines the weight given for student growth. They suggest a sliding scale within the sliding scale (depending on what is taught) to allow for the weight of shared attribution.

Group 2:

Looked at how to determine how student growth fits into model

The group suggested:

- Student Growth 40%
- Observation: 40%
- Parent and student survey: 20%

Within the 40% Student Growth:

- Content Specific=66%
- Shared attribution=34%

This model allows for a menu of options for Non-Tested grades and subjects to measure student growth.

The group suggested the need for state-based criteria for test development for non-tested grades and subjects.

Group 3:

Purpose: incentivize educator best practice (collaboration is essential)

- Students deserve goals with standards and expectation
- Flexibility needs to be part of the model

The group suggested that the model include shared attribution. They proposed using the model used by grading schools committee there is consistency, messaging and understanding.

Regarding non-tested/tested subjects or grades:

- The group started with 50/50 and moved from there
- After discussion they settled on 70% Student Growth and 30% Shared Attribution

The group also indicated the need for a common rubric or framework developed by the SEA for non-tested grades or subjects.

Discussion:

Identify Common Elements:

1. All have shared attribution (tested and non-tested)

Only a portion - varied from 10% to 34%

2. State responsibility for establishing criteria and framework for assessments of non-tested subjects and grades

(An idea was to perhaps choose from a bank of appropriate assessment questions?)

Guiding rubric for performance based measures for NTSG

- 3. Some flexibility at the LEA level (choosing from a menu)
- 4. Value comparability and accuracy
- 5. Transparent model

Lunch Break 12-1:00

4. National Center for Assessment Assistance

Scott Marion Chris Domaleski

- Review NTSG assessment types and analytic methods
- Develop criteria for quality student measures for NTSG
- Develop a state plan and timeline for NTSG

Scott Marion and Chris Domaleski, Center for Assessment presented: Assessment and Analytic Approaches for the use in Non-Tested Subjects and Grades.

Guiding Principles draft was passed out to committee members. Members were asked to review the Guiding Principles and send any additions or corrections to Lynne and Kerrie.

Closing Comments

Kerrie and Lynne

Some things to think about:

- What will apply to student growth? Status and growth from grading schools?
 Or just use growth measures? Should we use grading schools?
- What are the definitions we need to pay attention to?

- How do we determine proficiency in performance based on NTSG?
- How will be fit different solutions to different contexts?
- How will we classify the educators?

5. Future Meetings:

- Jan. 10: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- Feb. 7: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- Mar. 8: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- April 17: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- May 8: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Next Meeting scheduled for January 10th at the Law and Justice Center.

Lunch will be provided at noon. Thank you for your participation. Minutes will be sent electronically.